

NOV 28 2006

REMARKS

This Amendment and Response is in response to the Office Action dated September 13, 2006. With this Amendment, claims 1, 3, 5-8, 10, 12, 14, 16-19, 21, and 23 have been amended. Claims 2, 11, 13, 15, 20, 22, and 24 have been canceled. Claims 25-26 have been added. Claims 1, 3-10, 12, 14, 16-19, 21, 23, and 25-26 are pending in this application. In light of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests advancement of this application to allowance.

Amendments to the Specification

With this Amendment, a number of amendments have been made to the summary of the invention. These amendments have been made to generally reflect the amendments that have been made to the claims as described below. No new matter has been added to the specification as a result of these amendments.

New Claims

New claims 25 and 26 have been added to this application. Claim 25 is similar to original claim 4, except that it depends from claim 1. Claim 26 is similar to amended claim 10, except that it depends from claim 9. These claims are in condition for allowance.

Claim Objections

In the Office Action, claim 11 was objected to because of a typographical error. With this amendment, claim 11 has been canceled. Accordingly, the objection to claim 11 should be removed. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

In the Office Action, claims 12, 13, and 19-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Specifically, in claim 12 and claim 23 the term "moveable part" was suggested to lack antecedent basis. In addition, claim 19 was rejected for the phrase "eg."

With this amendment, claims 12 and 23 have been amended to remove the phrase "moveable part." Claims 13, 20, 22, and 24 have been canceled. In addition, claim 19 has been amended to remove the phrase "eg." Claim 21 has been amended to depend from claim 14, and does not lack antecedent basis. With these amendments, the rejections of claims 12, 13, 19, 21, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 should be removed.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102 and 35 U.S.C. §103**

In the Office Action, claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by the Yamagishi patent (U.S. Patent No. 5,647,469). In addition, claims 11-12, 14-18, and 23, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over the Yamagishi patent in view of the Glaser patent (U.S. Patent No. 5,915,519). With this Amendment, claims 2, 11, and 15 have been canceled. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Both of the references cited in the Office Action are good examples of arrangements discussed in the background, at pages 1 and 2 of the present application. These patents both include designs in which there is a hinged door over part or all of the coin path through the apparatus. For example, the Yamagishi patent discloses a sideways hinged gate, where gate plate 23 is pivoted above coil spring 14 at shaft 13. Similarly, the Glaser patent discloses a top hinged gate, where back plate 24 is pivotally mounted on the shaft 36 to swing away from the main plate 20.

In sharp contrast to the cited references, the pending claims are directed to a coin validator including a cover that is actuatable to "move said cover in a direction away from said first side of said coin path at said mounting points" (e.g., see independent claims 1 and 14), and not to a housing that is hinged about its mounting points. A cover which is actuatable to move in a direction away from the first side of the coin path at the mounting points is capable of a motion which, by definition, does not occur on a hinged axis.

An example of the claimed mounting is described in the specification at page 7, lines 4-9, and in original claim 8, which states that the mounting means includes two or more parallel slots in cooperating pins. This is similarly described at page 5, lines 7-8. In addition, the specification identifies the outward movement of the door in respect to movement along a slot

NOV 28 2006

portion 62 at page 7, lines 22-24. These examples illustrate that the claim amendments are adequately described in the specification and do not suggest that the claim interpretation should be limited to these embodiments. Rather, the plain meaning of the claims presented herein will be understood to be broader in scope than these limited examples.

Therefore independent claims 1 and 14 are in condition for allowance because the cited references do not teach or disclose each and every element of the claims. In addition, claims 3-10, 12, 14, 16-19, 21, 23, and 25-26 all depend from one of independent claims 1 and 14, and are also allowable. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the pending claims.

### Conclusion

In view of this Amendment and Response, Applicants respectfully request a Notice of Allowance. There may be additional reasons that the pending subject matter is patentably distinct from the cited references in addition to those discussed herein. Applicant reserves the right to raise any such arguments in the future. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of the application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.  
P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903  
(612) 332-5300

Date: Nov. 28, 2006

By: \_\_\_\_\_ W \_\_\_\_\_  
Name: Brian H. Batzli  
Reg. No. 32,960  
BHB/BAT:bog

